

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicants would like to thank the examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and for the personal interview conducted on April 18, 2006. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe and claim the subject matter, which applicants regard as the invention.

Claims 2-19 remain in this application. Claim 1 has been previously canceled

Claims 4, 7, 8, and 10-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hanright (U.S. 5,875,254). Claims 2, 3, 5, and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hanright in view of Johnson (U.S. 4,311,206). For the following reasons, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed at the personal interview, Hanright does not teach any channel formed in and along a shell member embedded in said shell member over at least a major portion of the length of the channel where the major portion follows a contour of the outer surface of the shell, as recited in amended claim 10. Instead, as was argued at the interview, it is clear that the channel cited by the Examiner does not have any major portion that follows a contour of the outer surface of the Hanright device, nor does the reference teach such a major portion being embedded in the shell. Accordingly, claim 10 is patentable over the reference.

Claims 11, 16, and 20, as amended, similarly recite a “major portion” of the channel (claim 11) or a major portion of an acoustic lead (claims 16 and 20) being embedded (claim 16) or at least partially embedded (claim 20) in the shell. Claim 11 recites the major portion of the channel following along a contour of the shell, and claims 16 and 20 recites the acoustic lead (claim 16) or a major portion of the acoustic lead (claim 20) running as a channel along a contour of the shell. Claim 16 also recites that the acoustic lead is bound by

the material of the shell along the major portion. The cited references do not teach any of these features, and thus these claims are patentable over the references as well.

The remaining claims, which depend, directly or indirectly, upon one of the above discussed claims are thus patentable over the references for at least the reasons discussed for the parent claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 32992.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

Date: June 4, 2007

By:           / Robert F. Bodi /            
Robert F. Bodi, Reg. No. 48,540

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700